

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner pointed out that Applicant had not responded to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections for claims 21, 23, 94, 95, 96, 97, 102, 103, 104, 105, 107 and 108 over Sidwell et al., European Patent Application EP 0 743 594 A1. Appropriate corrections have been made.

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

### Claim Objections

Claim 94 is objected to for using an “is” instead of an “are”. Appropriate correction has been made. Claim 116 is objected to for reciting bits “[32-0]” instead of “[31-0]”. Appropriate correction has been made. In addition, claim 97 has been amended to correct an editorial error.

### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 19-23, 93-106, 109-118 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Abdallah (US 6,115,812). However, Applicant respectfully asserts that Abdallah does not recite moving data from a source into non-contiguous destination locations and duplicating them into contiguous destination storage locations, as claimed by Applicant. Instead Abdallah merely moves source data into the destination register into contiguous locations and does not then duplicate the data moved into the contiguous locations, as claimed by applicant. Therefore, Abdallah does not teach that which applicant has claimed.

Claims 19, 20, 22, 83, 84, 86, 88, 89, and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sidwell et al., European Patent Application EP 9743594

A1. Applicant submits that Sidwell fails to teach that which applicant has claimed for similar reasons Applicant has explained in reference to Abdallah.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 107 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdallah.

As presented above in traversing the 35 U.S.C. rejections of independent claim 101, Abdallah does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 101. No other reference was cited by the Examiner to cure those deficiencies of Abdallah. Thus, claims 107 and 108, which depend from claim 101, are patentable over Abdallah. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 107 and 108 over Abdallah be withdrawn.

Claims 21, 23, 94-97, 102-105, 107 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sidwell.

As presented above in traversing the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of independent claims 19, 93, and 101, Sidwell does not teach or suggest the limitation of moving data from a source into non-contiguous destination locations and duplicating them into contiguous destination storage locations, recited in these independent claims. No other reference was cited to cure those deficiencies of Sidwell. Thus, claims 21, 23 (which depend from claim 21), claims 94-97 (which depend from claim 93), and claims 102-105, 107-108 (which depend from claim 101) are patentable over Sidwell. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 21, 23, 94-97, 102-105, 107 and 108 over Sidwell be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully submits the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Guojun Zhou at (503) 264-1700.

If any additional fees are required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 10, 2007

/Guojun Zhou/  
Guojun Zhou  
Registration No. 56,478  
**INTEL CORPORATION**  
MS JF3-147  
2111 NE 25<sup>th</sup> Ave.  
Hillsboro, OR. 97124